

Mr. DASCHLE. If the Senator from Nevada will yield, let me urge my colleagues. We have been polling our Members and have been told that we have about 130 amendments. If we have that many amendments, there is no reason why tonight we cannot have a good debate on some of these amendments. I would like to see a couple of them offered and debated tonight. The ranking member is here and prepared to work with any of our Members on this side. So I hope we can do that. If we have that many amendments, there is no reason why at 6 o'clock tonight we do not have more of an opportunity to discuss some of these important matters.

So I really urge all of our Democratic colleagues to cooperate in good faith and to come to the floor. This is a good time to be offering the amendments, and we will accommodate Senators as they come to the floor.

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator from Nevada will yield further, I make the same request. This is normally the late evening, Thursday evening, and we have not announced any votes this evening but we are prepared to do that if we can have the cooperation of Members, if they just come to the floor, debate the amendment, with the exception of the amendment of the Senator from New York, and then we can agree to vote on those tomorrow morning.

Following the votes, we would take up the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], with 1½ hours equally divided for debate. So we will put out a hotline on this side, and this is the time to offer amendments. We had 70-some on our list. You have, say, 150. If there are 200 amendments out there, there ought to be somebody willing to come to the floor at 6:20 on a Thursday evening—it is not even dark outside—and offer some amendments. We are prepared to do business. I know the Presiding Officer is very pleased to be here, and we will do our best. I thank my colleague.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

#### SENATOR BRYAN'S WORK ON THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mr. REID. The first criminal jury trial that I had involved a burglary case. As I recall, the jury trial took about 3 or 4 days. The reason I remember the case so clearly is that I was the attorney representing the defendant, the person charged with the crime. The prosecutor of that case was RICHARD BRYAN, then a young deputy district attorney in Clark County, NV. It was a good case. We had two young lawyers who had a real good battle in the courtroom.

Senator RICHARD BRYAN was an outstanding lawyer. He was the first public defender in the history of the State of Nevada. He and I took the Nevada bar together in 1963. We were the only

two freshmen elected to the Nevada State Legislature in 1969.

Not only did he have a successful and distinguished career as a private attorney, but he also served in the Nevada State Legislature as an assemblyman and as a Nevada State senator. He served as attorney general of the State of Nevada. He was elected twice to be Governor of the State of Nevada and has been elected twice to be a U.S. Senator from the State of Nevada.

The reason I mention this is I think, in the events that have taken place today, those six members of the Ethics Committee who have toiled months and months have been kind of forgotten about. This was a job not sought by Senator RICHARD BRYAN, who was chairman of the Ethics Committee. In fact, he took the job at his peril. He was running for reelection when then majority leader George Mitchell asked him to do his duty as a U.S. Senator and accept this task, this ordeal, to be chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee.

I have never talked to Senator BRYAN about the facts of the case that has been before this body today. But I know RICHARD BRYAN. I know him well. He and I have been friends for 30-odd years or more. And I know how this case has weighed on him. I see it in his face. I see it in his demeanor. As I have indicated, I have never discussed the case with him. But I know Senator BRYAN well, I repeat. I know that his obligation was to be fair to the victims, to be fair to the accused and to this institution and, of course, the oath that he took as a Senator.

The time that he spent on this case could have been spent working on other issues, could have been spent with his family and his friends, but he spent not minutes, not hours, not days, not weeks but months on this case.

When the elections took place last fall, Senator BRYAN became the ranking member of the Ethics Committee, and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL became chairman of the Ethics Committee.

Mr. President, I think that we, as Members of the Senate, should all acknowledge the work done by the Ethics Committee. I am speaking of my friend, Senator BRYAN. I am doing that because I know him so well. I know the time that he spent. I know his background. I know what a good person he is and how fair he tries to be with everybody in everything that he does.

Now, I can speak with more authority and certainty about Senator BRYAN than I can the other five members of the Ethics Committee, but these other five individuals coming from their varied backgrounds and experiences led to this Ethics Committee that had a sense of duty. It was bipartisan in nature, and being bipartisan in nature reached a conclusion in this most difficult case. Senators MIKULSKI and DORGAN on the Democratic side and Chairman MCCONNELL, Senators CRAIG and SMITH are also to be given appreciation by this Senator and I hope the rest of this

body for the time that they spent on this very thankless job.

Mr. President, I, of course, have talked in detail about Senator BRYAN and the person that he is. If I knew the other five members as well as I knew Senator BRYAN, I am sure that I could say the same things about them and the difficulty they had in arriving at the decision they did. I am sure that if I had spent the time with them as I have with Senator BRYAN, I could tell by their demeanor, I could tell by the looks on their faces the consternation and the difficulty they had in doing the work that they did on this case.

Mr. President, there is no way to compliment and applaud these gentlemen and the lady who serve on this committee in an adequate fashion, but I, I hope on behalf of the entire Senate and the people of this country, express to them my appreciation and our appreciation for doing what they did in this case, that is, working the long, hard, tireless hours they did and arriving at a decision that only they could arrive at.

Mr. President, in 1882, a member of the very small Nevada Supreme Court—there were three members of the supreme court in 1882—in a case cited at 106 U.S. 154, Justice Bradley said in that case these words that I think apply to what has taken place here today: "The event is always a great teacher."

Mr. President, the event that has taken place today has been a great teacher for us all and will be in the future.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

#### FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss three amendments that I intend to propose later in regard to this bill we are engaged today, this week, and probably into the next week with one of the most fundamental reforms of the welfare system in over a generation. It really is a debate of great historic importance to not only the people who are on welfare, but to all Americans.

The millions of Americans who are trapped in the cycle of welfare dependency need a way out. As we work on this bill, I believe that we have to make absolutely sure that as we do this, we do, in fact, give them a way out and not just put them into another revolving door.

The purpose of the first amendment that I will offer will be to make sure